THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
Washington, D. C.
Minutes - The Faculty Senate
Regular Meeting, Friday, March 10, 1972
Faculty Conference Room, sixth floor of the Library

Minute 1 Provost Bright presided. The meeting was called to order at 2:10 p.m., and then the following were introduced to the Senate: newly-elected members James L. Breen (Education), Joseph Foa (Engineering), John Kaye (Engineering), John A. Morgan, Jr. (Columbian College), Alvin E. Parris (Medical Center), Stefan O. Schiff (Columbian College), Edwin L. Stevens (Columbian College); reelected members Richard C. Allen (National Law Center), Philip H. Highfill, Jr. (Graduate School of Arts and Sciences), David Robinson, Jr. (National Law Center); and William E. Schmidt and Henry Solomon representing Columbian College members on sabbatical leave.

Present:

Lloyd H. Elliott
Harold F. Bright
Frederick R. Houser
Arthur E. Burns
Richard C. Allen
James L. Breen
Milton Crane
Roderic H. Davison
Marvin Eisenberg
Joseph Foa
Marvin Gordon
William B. Griffith
Philip H. Highfill, Jr.
John Kaye
Frederick C. Kurtz
Anthony Marinaccio
John A. Morgan, Jr.
Charles B. Nutting/Louis J. Harris
Alvin E. Parrish
Howard Pierpont
David Robinson, Jr.
Stefan O. Schiff
William E. Schmidt
Henry Solomon
Edwin L. Stevens
George V. Vahouny

Absent:

James C. Dockeray
Robert Kramer
Harold Liebowitz
Calvin D. Linton
John Parks
Burton M. Sapin
Rodney Tillman
Grover L. Angel
Daniel R. Cloutier
Harold C. Hinton

Minute 2 The minutes of the regular meeting of February 11, 1972, were approved as distributed.

Minute 5b The Chairman of the Executive Committee moved a change in the order of business so that Item 5b, Nomination and Election of the Executive Committee for 1972-73, might be taken up at that point. He reported certain members involved in the item had to leave early.

Dr. Bright determined the Senate agreed to the change, and then recognized Professor Richard C. Allen who presented on behalf of the Nominating Committee for the Executive Committee the following slate: Frederick C. Kurtz (SGBA), John A. Morgan, Jr. (Columbian College), Charles B. Nutting/Louis J. Harris (NLC) (Professor Harris was elected for the unexpired term of Professor Nutting who becomes emeritus in June), Alvin E. Parrish (Medical Center), and Edwin L. Stevens (Columbian College), Chairman.

The Chairman of the Executive Committee asked that Professor Nutting be recognized. Professor Nutting informed the Senate he had decided not to remain a member until his retirement in June, introduced his colleague, Professor Louis J. Harris, and asked him to take his place on the Senate and on the slate for the Executive Committee.

Professor Allen, with regret and an accolade to his respected colleague, withdrew Professor Nutting's name from the slate. There was no discussion, no nomination from the floor, and the slate was elected without opposition.

Minute 6 Brief Statements:

The Chairman of the Executive Committee asked that Professor Allen be recognized for a statement. Professor Allen informed the Senate his colleague, Professor Monroe H. Freedman, had some important information on the Wage-Price Freeze, also another commitment, and it was therefore requested there be a suspension of the rules and the privilege of the floor be given to Professor Freedman at that time. There was a favorable vote on suspension of the rules. Professor Freedman's statement is attached to these minutes.

Professor Allen stated he would not offer a resolution on the matter, but requested the Provost to ask Mr. Cantini and the University Counsel to meet with Professor Freedman and to report to the Senate any alterations. Dr. Bright said the request was granted.

Minute 3 Dr. Bright asked permission to change the order of business so that the report on Financial Support of University Libraries might be deferred. President Elliott was at a Financial Committee meeting but would join the Senate meeting later in the afternoon. The change in order of business was agreed to unanimously.

Minute 4a The Chairman of the Executive Committee asked that privilege of the floor be given to Professor LeBlanc, Chairman of the Committee on Physical Facilities, for the purpose of making that committee's special report on 71/3, A Resolution Recommending Hearings and Studies with Respect to New Buildings. On behalf of Physical Facilities, Professor Stevens moved the adoption of 71/32, A Resolution Relating to Planning and Design of New Buildings (incorporated in the special report), and it was seconded by Professor Morgan.

Professor Allen, a member of the committee, then spoke to the special report as follows:

"I concur in the report and recommendations of the Committee. I feel impelled to say, however, that I do not believe that the Committee has fully discharged its duties under Senate Resolution 71/3.

"No one who attended the meeting at which that Resolution was unanimously passed could have had any doubt that dissatisfaction within the University Community, with the Law Library and University Center, is both widespread and deeply felt. Nor could he have doubted that much of the University was stunned and disheartened when the architectural firm which designed these buildings was the one selected to design the new University Library and Medical School complex.

"It was the spirit, if not the explicit charge of Resolution 71/3, that the Committee on Physical Facilities should make findings of fact - to determine, to the best of its ability, what 'went wrong'; not for the purpose of assessing 'blame' (which our report suggests is the only alternative to its rather generally worded language), but in order to avoid such mistakes in the future.

"The Committee has chosen not to inquire into the serious defects in Law Library design testified to by the Law Librarian (e.g., stacks designed to meet general library needs, and hence too small to accommodate the larger law books which it must house); nor has it sought expert judgment concerning the charge (among others) of excessive waste or 'dead' space in the University Center; nor did it hear the complaints of medical school faculty members about the medical school under construction; nor did it request the firm of Mills, Petticord and Mills, the architect of each of these buildings, to send a representative to any of its sessions.

"The Committee has performed a useful service. Its findings and recommendations should be of value to the University in the future. Whether the Senate will feel that it has been fully enough informed about the matter referred to the Committee will have to be determined by that body."

Professor Allen added that he felt impelled not to inhibit passage of 71/32, but had decided to submit his "concurring" report when Mills, Petticord and Mills was again being looked to for the new Activities Building. He would leave to the body any other resolutions.

Professor LeBlanc's rebuttal was that all possibilities or alternatives for committee action had been discussed, and opportunity for suggestions and comments given to the committee members, before the special report was circulated (to the committee members and to the Senate members). He had received no indication that Professor Allen intended to file a "concurring" statement.

Professor Robinson then moved as an amendment to 71/32 the following Resolution Relating to Architectural Services for University Buildings, which he had distributed to the members just before the beginning of the meeting.

WHEREAS, the financial posture of the University is such that the most careful use of its resources is imperative; and

WHEREAS, the two major buildings designed by the architectural firm of Mills, Petticord and Mills, the Law Library and the University Center, have serious deficiencies in functional utility, esthetic quality, and appropriate and economical space allocation; and

WHEREAS, the University must be able to rely on the expertise of its architects to an extent not possible with this firm, in view of our experience with it;

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY THAT:

1. We hereby express our lack of confidence in the architectural services of the firm of Mills, Petticord and Mills; and

2. We call upon the administration of the University to seek other architectural assistance in future.

Professor Robinson proposed that the resolving text of 71/32 be added to the above resolution after the words, "BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED." Professor Allen seconded.

There followed warm debate on techniques for incorporating the amendment (which Professor Morgan pointed out was a substitute resolution), and reiteration by Professor Robinson of dissatisfaction with the architecture resulting in the Law Library and the University Center.

Professor Davison moved to table the Robinson amendment, and Dr. Vahouny seconded. The question was called and the motion to table carried. A division was requested, and the motion carried by 14 ayes, 5 nays. Dr. Pierpont pointed out to Professor Robinson that his resolution could be submitted at the next meeting of the Executive Committee on March 24 for consideration as an agenda item for the April meeting of the Senate. The question on 71/32 was called, put, and the resolution was adopted. Professor Highfill moved suspension of the rules so that the Robinson resolution might be introduced. Professor Schmidt seconded. The presiding officer, after a vote of 6 in favor, 7 opposed, declared the motion lost.

Minute 4b Professor Robinson moved the adoption of 71/33, A Resolution Relating to Faculty Performance Standards. Professor Kurtz seconded. Professor Robinson spoke briefly to the resolution which was being offered by University Objectives in the absence of a report from Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom. He stated his committee's consensus there was a need to remind what the regulations are, and for prompt attention to substantive rules and procedures for their enforcement.

Professor Kurtz moved the following amendment: in Pars. 1 and 2 of the resolving text insert "an elected faculty committee representative of each" before "department." Dr. Pierpont seconded.

Professor Robinson did not oppose the amendment, and suggested that by striking "head" in Pars. 1 and 2 the intention would be met. This was agreeable to Professor Kurtz.

Professor Kurtz moved an amendment to Par. 4, line 1, of the resolving text: insert after "Freedom" the words "formulate a faculty code of conduct and." Professor Robinson agreed to this wording, and added on his own behalf "procedures for enforcement to conform with recommendation of the Commission on Governance." Par. 4 as agreed to by mover and seconder then read, "The Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom formulate a faculty code of conduct and enforcement procedures to conform with the recommendation of the Commission on Governance, and report its progress in these matters by November 1, 1972, and aim for completion of the project by February, 1973."

Debate followed by Professors Morgan, Robinson, Griffith, Kurtz, Kramer and Pierpont. During it Professor Robinson clarified it was the thrust of University-wide Resolution 71/33 to implement the recommendation in the report of the Commission on Governance concerning the Code and Ordinances, and to establish a deadline for presentation by the Committee on Professional Ethics (after consultation with each department) of modifications to the Code and Ordinances. The proposed changes would then go through procedures.

Dr. Kramer reported that Professional Ethics had thus far completed review of four of the eight areas of the Code, and that work was going forward fairly rapidly but not too rapidly as the wording had to be considered carefully.

Professor Morgan moved to defer action on 71/33, to refer the resolution as reworded to the Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom, and to await report. Professor Davison seconded. The question was called, put, and the motion carried.

Minute 4c Chairman Sharkey on behalf of the Athletics Committee spoke briefly in support of Resolutions 71/34, A Resolution Recommending the Construction of a Physical Education-Activities Building, and 71/35, A Resolution Recommending the Establishment of a George Washington University Athletic Club. The two resolutions were the results of discussions at meetings of the ad hoc Committee on the Activities Building, where the Senate was represented by Professor Fox and the reporter. The Senate Athletics Committee endorsed the resolutions.

Professor Morgan moved 71/34 and Professor Kurtz seconded.

Debate at length followed and was participated in by Professors Robinson, Sharkey, Griffith, Highfill, President Elliott, Student Charles J. Szlenker (given privilege of the floor at the request of Professor Marinaccio), and Provost Bright. During discussion the vagueness of 71/34 was criticized. Both Chairman and Dr. Bright (who is chairman of the ad hoc Committee on the Activities Building) testified to the difficulty of getting an assessment of activities, despite meetings, hearings and questionnaires. 71/34 was intended as a statement of Faculty Senate approval of the principle of constructing the facility. Chairman Sharkey stated there would be no mortgage involved, and there would be no building unless the funds were in hand.

President Elliott spoke forcefully for such a facility, stating the commitment had been made four years ago when GW gave up football. $250,000 per year had been put aside with the commitment toward the kind of program proposed. The amount was still

budgeted. Supposing fund-raising succeeded in building the structure, the $250,000 would continue for operating costs of the new facility. He spoke also of the value of such a facility in the recruitment of students, especially undergraduate students.

Professor Robinson moved to refer 71/34 to another committee for report on alternatives, such committee (probably Resources) to be designated by the Executive Committee. Professor Griffith seconded.

Registrar Houser spoke in favor of the facility, citing the contribution it would make to esprit de corps, also to registration process. Discussion continued with Professors Allen, Schiff, Morgan, Eisenberg, Sharkey, Marinaccio, Robinson, and Dr. Bright contributing. President Elliott then spoke again (in essense) as follows:

> When I came to GW in 1965 we listed the generally accepted and recognized needs of the campus as follows:
>
> New Library
> New Classroom Building
> New Medical School/Basic Science Building
> Field House
>
> Most of these facilities have been built or are under way. The total list of construction projects was approved in that development plan of 1966. We are now proposing to proceed to build this part of the development program approved in 1966, and we are asking the Senate to indicate its sentiment on that project. I ask you to inquire of me, and to require of us any interim reports you wish as to the program as it goes along. Assessing the capability for fund-raising, we have come to the conclusion about $5,000,000 is what we can expect to raise within a reasonable period of 18 months or two years. What you are indicating today -- recognizing the limitations of the resolution -- is the sentiment and direction of the Faculty Senate. I think the Board of Trustees is ready to affirm this project as part of the total University program. We should like to proceed to talk with prospective donors about a $4 or $5 million project which would house a varsity basketball court, where most seats would be movable so it could be used for smaller courts, with a swimming pool, locker rooms, dressing rooms, multipurpose rooms, etc. This facility would supply a need on campus for students who wish to have such a facility available for physical education/recreational activities on a voluntary basis. It would enhance the recruiting program.

Professor Kurtz spoke against the motion to refer.

Professor Highfill removed his rejection of 71/34 on the following bases: 1) the building of the facility would not bleed the resources of the rest of the University; 2) the facility would not be built until the money was in hand; 3) the project needed faculty support; and 4) the facility would supply a recruitment need. Professor Allen also went on record as supporting 71/34. Professor Griffith continued to support referral.

The question was called on the motion to refer, put, and the motion was lost.

motion to table

e resolving text by striking "recommends" and inserting
Davison seconded, and suggested another change:
"program" the words "as explained by President
d Highfill." This was acceptable to the mover. The
ent and it carried. The question was called on
t was adopted.

tion 71/35. He reported the GWU Athletic Club was
he ad hoc committee to enlist alumni support. There
n a short radius of the campus, and their membership
to the athletics program. $50 of the dues per member
ce of the building. Membership would be open to both
e restricted with respect to students, staff, faculty.
)-$300 a year.

s Highfill, Schiff, Solomon, Morgan, Griffith and
aised a point of order -- whether there was a motion
pon moved to table 71/35, and the motion was seconded
The question was called, put, and the motion to table
carried.

Minute 3 President Elliott added one brief comment to his Report on Financial Support of University Libraries (attached) which had been distributed to Senate members as part of the agenda. He felt strongly the way to get additional support for the libraries was to get behind the newly-created group, Friends of the Library, which is under the leadership of Director of Libraries Woodward and of Vice-President Alpert. He expressed the conviction more financial support could be attracted from friends and alumni who had a special interest in the libraries of the University, more perhaps than in the University as a whole. He endorsed support of the libraries and promised to work in every way to get it.

Professor Griffith responded on behalf of the Library Committee. He stated so far as he could see there was no move toward a new policy of funding libraries on a year to year basis. The references in the President's report for improvement in acquisitions and services, to the Consortium Libraries, and to the Friends of the Library were to standard policies. He stated it seemed to the Library Committee this dependence upon other libraries, on Friends of the Library, on fund-raising projects, and on gifts from the outside might not be a wise policy.

Minute 4d Dr. Pierpont on behalf of the Executive Committee moved the adoption of 71/36, A Resolution Relating to Religious Holidays. Professor Kurtz seconded. Dr. Pierpont reported the resolution was an outgrowth of the Educational Policy Committee's statement "that as a secular institution this University should not observe any religious holidays." President Elliott subsequently had asked the Executive Committee to consider actions taken by other universities. The policy set forth in the resolution was already in practice. Upon being questioned by Professor Schiff concerning implementation, Dr. Pierpont stated it was not the intent of the Executive Committee to spell out procedures but to establish principle, and that 71/36 left implementation with the professors. There was no further discussion. The question was called, put, and Resolution 71/36 was adopted without opposition.

Minute 5a Dr. Pierpont on behalf of the Executive Committee placed in nomination for presidential appointment to the Steering Committee for the All-University Assembly the following names: A. E. Claeyssens, Jr. (English), Norman C. Kramer (Medicine), Hugh L. LeBlanc (Political Science and Public Affairs), Margaret W. Montzka (Physics), David Robinson, Jr. (Law), David B. Weaver (Law), and Reuben E. Wood (Chemistry). Dr. Pierpont also read eight names endorsed by the Student Faculty Union for an Open University and transmitted to the Executive Committee by that organization's Secretary, Professor Peter P. Hill: Astere Claeyssens, Diane Brewer, Roderic Davison, William Griffith, Peter Hill, Robert Kenny, Robert Park and Harry Yeide. Professor Highfill seconded the Executive Committee's slate. Nominations from the floor were then in order. Professor Allen nominated Professors Peter P. Hill and John A. Morgan, Jr. Professor Morgan asked that his name be withdrawn. Professor Griffith nominated Professor Barry Hyman. Professor Allen nominated Professor Griffith. There were no other nominations. Professor Morgan moved that those who received the largest number of votes on the first ballot be declared elected. The motion was seconded and carried. Six names on the Executive Committee's slate were elected; however, there was a tie between Professors Hyman Robinson and ~~Professor~~ Griffith which necessitated a second ballot and which resulted in Professor Griffith's name being the seventh recommended to the President for appointment to the Steering Committee.

Suspension of Rules, Res. 71/37

Professor Nutting requested and was granted suspension of the rules for A Resolution of Appreciation for Dr. Pierpont (71/37). He asked the presiding officer to read the resolution on the occasion of Dr. Pierpont's retiring from the Executive Committee (but not from the Senate) where he had served for three consecutive sessions:

> BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY:
>
> That the Faculty Senate extend its grateful appreciation to Dr. Howard Pierpont for his energetic and efficient services to the University during his term of office as Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate.
>
> March 10, 1972 (sgd) Lloyd H. Elliott
> President

The resolution was warmly seconded and adopted by a rising and unanimous vote. Dr. Pierpont responded by saying that his experience during the past year as Chairman of the Executive Committee had given him new insight and that the Faculty Senate was the consensus and true conscience of the University. He had been proud to serve.

Minute 6 (cont.) Brief Statements:

Dr. Bright announced that, as the Educational Policy Committee had requested at the February meeting of the Senate, the following revision in the academic calendar was mailed February 24 to administrative officers, deans, and department chairmen:

1) After spring vacation, classes will be resumed on Tuesday, April 4, rather than on Monday, April 3.

2) The last day of classes for the spring semester will be Monday, May 1, rather than Friday, April 28.

Administrative offices of the University will remain open on April 3.

Professor Griffith stated the Library Committee had asked him to commend joining Friends of the Library, and the sending of funds to Friends of the Library.

Minute 7 Dr. Bright, hearing a motion to adjourn seconded, adjourned the meeting at 5:55 p.m.

Frederick R. Houser

Frederick R. Houser
Secretary

THE
GEORGE
WASHINGTON
UNIVERSITY

*Washington, D.C. 20006 / **Office of the President** / (202) 676-6500*

February 29, 1972

To: The Faculty Senate

From: President Lloyd H. Elliott Lloyd H. Elliott

Subject: Report on Financial Support of University Libraries

In response to the commitment made to the Faculty Senate at its last meeting on Friday, February 11, the following is offered in the way of additional information which may be helpful as all of us work to ameliorate the difficult financial problems now facing the University.

The Budget Office has supplied the attached financial information covering a fifteen year period. While the figures reflect substantial and steadily increasing support for the libraries, I join those who feel that it is not enough. I differ, however, from those who feel that the solution is to be found in "reordering institutional priorities" (without further clarification of what priorities) or establishing an arbitrary formula which has little regard for the particular or special needs of various programs of the University or the presence or absence of other library resources within geographical reach of students and faculty members.

While vigorously pursuing a policy of strengthening on-campus library resources, as evidenced by a new Law Library Building completed and in use, a new Medical School Library now under construction, and a new University Library also under way, I believe important new Library resources have been brought within reach of George Washington students and faculty members through cooperative efforts which have been made through the Consortium of Washington Area Universities. These efforts should be continued. In addition, I am encouraged by the creation recently of a new organization, Friends of the Libraries of the George Washington University, which has among its objectives to "provide and attract new financial support to enrich the book collections of the Libraries." The organization has already taken action to designate its income from dues and gifts to be used annually for the book funds of the Law, Medical and University Libraries. It would be my hope that many members of the immediate University community, as well as friends and alumni from greater distances, will find this new organization to be high on their own priorities of interest in and support for the University.

In summary, let me say quite candidly that I have no argument with anyone who wishes to secure increased financial support for our Libraries. It is not enough, however, to request or suggest a "reordering of priorities." We now face a time when economic pressures make it increasingly hazardous to raise tuition as we have done over the past dozen years. More and more families are turning to public institutions for relief from the rapidly rising costs of private higher education. Our own reduction in entering classes is due, I believe, more directly to increasing costs than to any other single factor. Whether or not the present situation is temporary remains to be seen, and the extent to which, if any, relief may be found from Government subsidies is likewise unknown. Reordering priorities, therefore, must concern itself with reducing current expenditures, which can come about only by reassessing all of our programs and our ways of conducting them. With the help of a small Ford Foundation grant made two years ago and a small grant from the Sloan Foundation secured in January of 1972, the Budget Office under the direction of the Provost is vigorously pursuing a program budgeting effort in order that we may have better information in the future on which to make decisions regarding priorities. In the meantime, I believe further relief can be found by pushing cooperation through the Consortium of Universities as well as with other institutions in Washington which are rich in library resources and in vigorously purusing new support through Friends of the Libraries.

-0-

The George Washington University

Library Expenditures & Projected Budgets

1961-62 - 1975-76

		Library	Educational & General Expenditures	% to Educational & General
Expenditures	1961-62	239,000	12,900,000	1.9%
	1962-63	285,000	15,500,000	1.8%
	1963-64	289,000	17,700,000	1.6%
	1964-65	369,000	21,300,000	1.7%
(Ten Months)	1965-66	355,000	21,500,000	1.7%
	1966-67	507,000	29,000,000	1.7%
	1967-68	664,000	33,500,000	2.0%
	1968-69	840,000	36,150,000	2.3%
	1969-70	931,000	37,300,000	2.5%
	1970-71	1,134,000	39,100,000	2.9%
Projected Budgets	1971-72	1,205,000	43,581,000	2.8%
	1972-73	1,307,000	45,999,000	2.8%
	1973-74	1,479,000	47,909,000	3.1%
	1974-75	1,545,000	49,308,000	3.1%
	1975-76	1,614,000	50,740,000	3.2%

Not included in projected expenditures listed above:

In 1973-74 and thereafter	- Operation and maintenance of New University Library will increase with inflation and other factors	$190,000
	- Debt service on new Library	250,000
		$440,000

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

INTERDEPARTMENTAL MEMORANDUM

March 15, 1972

To: Faculty Senate

From: Professor Monroe H. Freedman

Re: Wage Freeze

The following is a resume of my comments at the last meeting of the Senate.

1) The freeze applies not to individual increases nor to the University as a whole, but to "employee units," e.g., departments within the University.

2) Assuming an employee unit of 40 faculty members (including assistant, associate, and full professors) and a salary budget of $800,000 in October, 1971, a 5.5% increase would appear to impose a limit as follows:

$800,000
x .055
$ 44,000 total increase = an average of $1,100 per professor

N.B.: The average per professor is not the maximum for each. The total increase can be divided up within the unit in any way at all.

3) The true base is not the salary budget per se, but includes various fringes, e.g., life insurance, medical insurance, TIAA-CREF contributions, tuition benefits, etc. There is no limit to this fringe increment to the salary base, but 20% seems a reasonable estimate. This would raise the $800,000 base in our hypothetical unit to $960,000.

4) If raises are based in part on merit, i.e., performance of specific responsibilities such as teaching, writing, committee work, etc., the percentage increase can be advanced from 5.5% to 7%.

N.B.: There are other ways to reach the 7% figure, e.g., if the University acts before March 31, 1972, individual employee units might qualify under the catch-up provision.

5) Thus, the calculation in paragraph 2 should be changed to read:

$960,000
x .07
$ 67,000 total increase = an average of $1,680 per professor

6) Increases resulting from time in service ("longevity") are exempt from the 7% increase. That is, if in recent years everyone in the unit has gotten some minimum raise, that amount can be regarded as a longevity increase. Accordingly, if no one has received less than $320 increase in recent years, the salary-increase pool can be higher by $12,800 ($320 x 40). Thus, the total becomes:

$67,200
+12,800
$80,000 total increase = an average of $2,000 per professor

7) Increases attributable to promotions are also exempt. For example, if two assistant professors become associates, and two associates become full professors, and if these promotions result in, say, $2,000 increases for each of the four professors, the total available budget for the unit as a whole is increased accordingly. Thus:

$80,000
+ 8,000
$88,000 total increase = an average of $2,200 per professor

8) There are other refinements. For example, if someone is hired at an above-average rate, the above-average part of that salary does not come out of the pool.

9) Therefore, in our hypothetical employee unit, the total budget available for salary increases would be $88,000 rather than the $44,000 that it would appear to be on a simple 5.5% calculation. The precise figures, of course, will vary in factual context, but the important fact is that faculty salary increases can relate to the University's need to keep and attract first-rate people, rather than to an arbitrary (and not-really-existent) government limit. In short, the amount of ice in the wage freeze depends entirely on whether you take it on the rocks or straight up -- and up.

M.N.L

3/10/72

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
INTERDEPARTMENTAL MEMORANDUM

Marmorin

Le Blanc 1971-72
Dawson
Solomon
Foa
Robinson

Eisenberg
Kaye
Highfill
Gordon
Schmidt
Kurtz

Burns
Office
Crane
Breen
Kramer
Parrish

Stevens
Gentzing 1971-72
Griffith
Vahouny

Harris
Nutting
Morgan
Schaff
allen

+ President = 22 members

Faculty Senate

A RESOLUTION OF APPRECIATION (71/37)

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY:

That the Faculty Senate extend its grateful appreciation to Dr. Howard Pierpont for his energetic and efficient services to the University during his term of office as Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate.

Lloyd H. Elliott
President

March 10, 1972

THE
GEORGE
WASHINGTON
UNIVERSITY

Washington, D.C. 20006

Resolved: That the Faculty Senate of the George Washington University extend its grateful appreciation to Dr Howard Pierpont for his energetic and efficient services to the University during his term of office as Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate.

from Dr. Nutting

Faculty Senate Members - f.y.i., reference
Item 3, Agenda March 3, 1972

THE
GEORGE
WASHINGTON
UNIVERSITY

*Washington, D.C. 20006 / **Office of the President** / (202) 676-6500*

February 29, 1972

To: The Faculty Senate

From: President Lloyd H. Elliott Lloyd H. Elliott

Subject: Report on Financial Support of University Libraries

In response to the commitment made to the Faculty Senate at its last meeting on Friday, February 11, the following is offered in the way of additional information which may be helpful as all of us work to ameliorate the difficult financial problems now facing the University.

The Budget Office has supplied the attached financial information covering a fifteen year period. While the figures reflect substantial and steadily increasing support for the libraries, I join those who feel that it is not enough. I differ, however, from those who feel that the solution is to be found in "reordering institutional priorities" (without further clarification of what priorities) or establishing an arbitrary formula which has little regard for the particular or special needs of various programs of the University or the presence or absence of other library resources within geographical reach of students and faculty members.

While vigorously pursuing a policy of strengthening on-campus library resources, as evidenced by a new Law Library Building completed and in use, a new Medical School Library now under construction, and a new University Library also under way, I believe important new Library resources have been brought within reach of George Washington students and faculty members through cooperative efforts which have been made through the Consortium of Washington Area Universities. These efforts should be continued. In addition, I am encouraged by the creation recently of a new organization, Friends of the Libraries of the George Washington University, which has among its objectives to "provide and attract new financial support to enrich the book collections of the Libraries." The organization has already taken action to designate its income from dues and gifts to be used annually for the book funds of the Law, Medical and University Libraries. It would be my hope that many members of the immediate University community, as well as friends and alumni from greater distances, will find this new organization to be high on their own priorities of interest in and support for the University.

In summary, let me say quite candidly that I have no argument with anyone who wishes to secure increased financial support for our Libraries. It is not enough, however, to request or suggest a "reordering of priorities." We now face a time when economic pressures make it increasingly hazardous to raise tuition as we have done over the past dozen years. More and more families are turning to public institutions for relief from the rapidly rising costs of private higher education. Our own reduction in entering classes is due, I believe, more directly to increasing costs than to any other single factor. Whether or not the present situation is temporary remains to be seen, and the extent to which, if any, relief may be found from Government subsidies is likewise unknown. Reordering priorities, therefore, must concern itself with reducing current expenditures, which can come about only by reassessing all of our programs and our ways of conducting them. With the help of a small Ford Foundation grant made two years ago and a small grant from the Sloan Foundation secured in January of 1972, the Budget Office under the direction of the Provost is vigorously pursuing a program budgeting effort in order that we may have better information in the future on which to make decisions regarding priorities. In the meantime, I believe further relief can be found by pushing cooperation through the Consortium of Universities as well as with other institutions in Washington which are rich in library resources and in vigorously purusing new support through Friends of the Libraries.

-0-

The George Washington University

Library Expenditures & Projected Budgets

1961-62 - 1975-76

		Library	Educational & General Expenditures	% to Educational & General
Expenditures	1961-62	239,000	12,900,000	1.9%
	1962-63	285,000	15,500,000	1.8%
	1963-64	289,000	17,700,000	1.6%
	1964-65	369,000	21,300,000	1.7%
(Ten Months)	1965-66	355,000	21,500,000	1.7%
	1966-67	507,000	29,000,000	1.7%
	1967-68	664,000	33,500,000	2.0%
	1968-69	840,000	36,150,000	2.3%
	1969-70	931,000	37,300,000	2.5%
	1970-71	1,134,000	39,100,000	2.9%
Projected Budgets	1971-72	1,205,000	43,581,000	2.8%
	1972-73	1,307,000	45,999,000	2.8%
	1973-74	1,479,000	47,909,000	3.1%
	1974-75	1,545,000	49,308,000	3.1%
	1975-76	1,614,000	50,740,000	3.2%

Not included in projected expenditures listed above:

In 1973-74 and thereafter - Operation and maintenance of New University Library will increase with inflation and other factors $190,000

- Debt service on new Library 250,000

$440,000

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

INTERDEPARTMENTAL MEMORANDUM

March 15, 1972

To: Faculty Senate

From: Professor Monroe H. Freedman

Re: Wage Freeze

The following is a resume of my comments at the last meeting of the Senate.

1) The freeze applies not to individual increases nor to the University as a whole, but to "employee units," e.g., departments within the University.

2) Assuming an employee unit of 40 faculty members (including assistant, associate, and full professors) and a salary budget of $800,000 in October, 1971, a 5.5% increase would appear to impose a limit as follows:

$800,000
x .055
$ 44,000 total increase = an average of $1,100 per professor

N.B.: The average per professor is not the maximum for each. The total increase can be divided up within the unit in any way at all.

3) The true base is not the salary budget per se, but includes various fringes, e.g., life insurance, medical insurance, TIAA-CREF contributions, tuition benefits, etc. There is no limit to this fringe increment to the salary base, but 20% seems a reasonable estimate. This would raise the $800,000 base in our hypothetical unit to $960,000.

4) If raises are based in part on merit, i.e., performance of specific responsibilities such as teaching, writing, committee work, etc., the percentage increase can be advanced from 5.5% to 7%.

N.B.: There are other ways to reach the 7% figure, e.g., if the University acts before March 31, 1972, individual employee units might qualify under the catch-up provision.

5) Thus, the calculation in paragraph 2 should be changed to read:

$960,000
x .07
$ 67,000 total increase = an average of $1,680 per professor

6) Increases resulting from time in service ("longevity") are exempt from the 7% increase. That is, if in recent years everyone in the unit has gotten some minimum raise, that amount can be regarded as a longevity increase. Accordingly, if no one has received less than $320 increase in recent years, the salary-increase pool can be higher by $12,800 ($320 x 40). Thus, the total becomes:

$67,200
+12,800
$80,000 total increase = an average of $2,000 per professor

7) Increases attributable to promotions are also exempt. For example, if two assistant professors become associates, and two associates become full professors, and if these promotions result in, say, $2,000 increases for each of the four professors, the total available budget for the unit as a whole is increased accordingly. Thus:

$80,000
+ 8,000
$88,000 total increase = an average of $2,200 per professor

8) There are other refinements. For example, if someone is hired at an above-average rate, the above-average part of that salary does not come out of the pool.

9) Therefore, in our hypothetical employee unit, the total budget available for salary increases would be $88,000 rather than the $44,000 that it would appear to be on a simple 5.5% calculation. The precise figures, of course, will vary in factual context, but the important fact is that faculty salary increases can relate to the University's need to keep and attract first-rate people, rather than to an arbitrary (and not-really-existent) government limit. In short, the amount of ice in the wage freeze depends entirely on whether you take it on the rocks or straight up -- and up.

M.R.L.

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
Washington, D. C.

The Faculty Senate March 3, 1972

The Faculty Senate will meet on Friday, March 10, 1972, at 2:10 p.m., in the Faculty Conference Room on the sixth floor of the Library.

1) Call to order;
welcome to newly elected Senate Members James Breen, Joseph Foa, John Kaye, John Morgan, Alvin Parrish, Stefan Schiff, Edwin Stevens; and to reelected Senate Members Richard Allen, Philip Highfill, David Robinson

2) Minutes of the regular meeting of February 11, 1972

3) Special Business
Report: Financial Support of University Libraries. President Elliott

4) a) Report by Chairman Hugh L. LeBlanc, Committee on Physical Facilities, on Senate charge under Resolution 71/3; and A RESOLUTION RELATING TO PLANNING AND DESIGN OF NEW BUILDINGS (71/32)

b) A RESOLUTION RELATING TO FACULTY PERFORMANCE STANDARDS (71/33), Chairman David Robinson, Jr., Committee on University Objectives

c) Report by Chairman Robert P. Sharkey, Athletics Committee on the Physical Education - Activities Building; and RESOLUTION RECOMMENDING THE CONSTRUCTION OF A PHYSICAL EDUCATION - ACTIVITIES BUILDING (71/34); and RESOLUTION RECOMMENDING THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY ATHLETIC CLUB (71/35)

d) A RESOLUTION RELATING TO RELIGIOUS HOLIDAYS (71/36), The Executive Committee

5) General Business
a) Nomination of seven members of the faculty for presidential appointment to the Steering Committee for an All-University Assembly. Note: The slate is still under consideration, but will be mailed to Senate Members prior to the March 10 meeting.

b) Presentation by Richard C. Allen on behalf of the Nominating Committee for the Executive Committee of the slate for 1972-73: Frederick C. Kurtz (SGBA), John A. Morgan, Jr. (Columbian College), Charles B. Nutting/Louis J. Harris (NLC), Alvin E. Parrish (Medical Center), and Edwin L. Stevens (Columbian College), Chairman

6) Brief Statements

7) Adjournment

Frederick R. Houser
Secretary

A RESOLUTION RELATING TO NEW BUILDINGS (71/32)

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY:

That the President, with the advice and consultation of the Faculty Senate, shall appoint a committee representative of the anticipated users of a proposed building to:

1. Advise and consult with the appropriate administrative officers in preparing the program for a new building;

2. Advise and consult with the appropriate administrative officers in the selection of an architect to design a new building;

3. Advise and consult with appropriate administrative officers and the architect after review of each of the program schematic, preliminary and final design stages; however, it is understood that instructions to the architect can be made only with the approval of the university's designated project officer; and

4. Promptly inform the Vice President and Treasurer in writing of their dissatisfaction with any phase of the planning or design processes.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED:

That periodic reports be made to the Committee on Physical Facilities of the Faculty Senate by appropriate administrative officers to advise of progress in the planning and design of each new building (including architect selection) and its relationship to overall campus plans.

Committee on Physical Facilities

February 22, 1972

A RESOLUTION RELATING TO FACULTY PERFORMANCE STANDARDS
(71/33)

WHEREAS, increasing competitiveness in quality and in lower attendance costs by state universities and colleges require that contemporary private universities offer superior and distinctive educational opportunities to students; and

WHEREAS, the present Code and Ordinances provides:

"III. Professional Responsibilities

A member of the staff shall perform well his academic duties; strive for professional development; and apply his talents to the service of his profession, his community, and the country.

A. In his classroom a member of the staff is responsible for the character of the instruction, the maintenance of good order, and the observance of University regulations. He shall make adequate preparation for his classes and conduct them in a dignified and courteous manner.

B. A member of the staff shall perform conscientiously his other academic duties, such as meeting classes on time; holding classes for the full period; grading tests and examinations and reporting the grades promptly; reporting promptly to the appropriate dean matters requiring disciplinary action and matters relating to the physical condition of classrooms and laboratories; attending faculty meetings, commencement exercises, convocations, and other academic events; serving on faculty or University committees; assisting in the administrative work of his department or in the general administrative work of the University; and serving as a general or departmental adviser to students.

C. A member of the staff should strive to grow in professional competence by means of sound scholarship, effective teaching, and original contributions. He should be a student of contemporary life so as to be able to interpret his field in the light of related knowledge. He should strive for the advancement of knowledge in his field of learning by individual research and by participation in the activities of professional societies.

D. A member of the faculty on full-time service shall have the primary responsibility of devoting his time, thought, and energy to the service of the University. No such member of the faculty shall accept an outside teaching appointment during the academic year or engage in any other regular activity of a remunerative nature without the approval of the University. A member of the faculty on full-time service is under obligation not to permit such employment, even when officially approved, to interfere with his responsibility to the University."; and

WHEREAS, the present faculty performance standards of The George Washington University are sufficiently vague that faculty members may be unsure of their specific obligations to the University, to the students, and to their professional growth; and

WHEREAS, the Commission on Governance of the University recommended the Faculty Senate "should take the lead in broadly based studies and discussion leading to the formulation of a code of conduct dealing with rights and responsibilities of the faculty and others in more detail than is presently furnished by the Faculty Code and Ordinances"; and

WHEREAS, the individual college faculties and departments are especially competent to reasonably specify appropriate standards of performance for their faculties; and

WHEREAS, such specification should include guidelines covering items such as minimum conference hours for students; minimum hours committed directly to University business; maximum conflicting commitments or hours devoted to non-university business, whether compensated or charitable; procedures for processing student complaints; publication and research standards; reporting procedures for missed classes, variations from catalog course description, etc.; and recording procedures for work performed; and

WHEREAS, procedures for enforcement of standards whether (1) informal; (2a) formal, but seeking sanctions short of discharge (e.g., withholding of salary); and (2b) discharge procedures are not adequately drafted at present; therefore

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY THAT:

1. Each Dean or Director obtain from each department head a report on performance guidelines reasonably required by the programs of the College and department concerned;

2. The Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom study these reports and confer with the Deans and department heads to reconcile inappropriate discrepancies among the guidelines;

3. The Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom study the faculty oversight and disciplinary procedures in being at The George Washington University and recommend such changes as are necessary to provide in sufficient detail for a full range of appropriate responses to nonfeasance or misfeasance in performance; and

4. The Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom report its progress in these matters by November 1, 1972, and aim for completion of the project by February, 1973.

Committee on University Objectives
February 17, 1972

RESOLUTION RECOMMENDING THE CONSTRUCTION OF A PHYSICAL EDUCATION - ACTIVITIES BUILDING (71/34)

Whereas, the Faculty Senate Athletics Committee has discussed the proposed program of the planned Physical Education - Activities Building; and

Whereas, it finds the program to be generally satisfactory; therefore

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY THAT

The Faculty Senate recommends the construction by the University of a Physical Education - Activities Building.

RESOLUTION RECOMMENDING THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY ATHLETIC CLUB (71/35)

Whereas, it is necessary and important for the University to increase the contacts it has with its alumni; and

Whereas, it is important to increase the financial support of the University by its alumni; therefore

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY THAT

The Faculty Senate recommends the establishment of a George Washington University Athletic Club to be housed in the planned Physical Education - Activities Building. Such a Club would be open to all members of the University Community and would provide its members with health club type facilities as well as access to the other, open facilities in the building, e.g., pool, handball courts, etc. All members of the Club would pay dues (student rates would be lower), and the Club would be self-supporting.

Athletics Committee of the Faculty Senate
February 18, 1972

A RESOLUTION RELATING TO RELIGIOUS HOLIDAYS (71/36)

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY THAT:

Students be accorded on an individual basis by their instructors the courtesy of absence on their traditional religious holidays without academic penalty.

The Executive Committee

February 25, 1972

Faculty Senate Members - f.y.i., reference
Item 3, Agenda March 3, 1972

THE
GEORGE
WASHINGTON
UNIVERSITY

*Washington, D.C. 20006 / **Office of the President** / (202) 676-6500*

February 29, 1972

To: The Faculty Senate

From: President Lloyd H. Elliott Lloyd H. Elliott

Subject: Report on Financial Support of University Libraries

In response to the commitment made to the Faculty Senate at its last meeting on Friday, February 11, the following is offered in the way of additional information which may be helpful as all of us work to ameliorate the difficult financial problems now facing the University.

The Budget Office has supplied the attached financial information covering a fifteen year period. While the figures reflect substantial and steadily increasing support for the libraries, I join those who feel that it is not enough. I differ, however, from those who feel that the solution is to be found in "reordering institutional priorities" (without further clarification of what priorities) or establishing an arbitrary formula which has little regard for the particular or special needs of various programs of the University or the presence or absence of other library resources within geographical reach of students and faculty members.

While vigorously pursuing a policy of strengthening on-campus library resources, as evidenced by a new Law Library Building completed and in use, a new Medical School Library now under construction, and a new University Library also under way, I believe important new Library resources have been brought within reach of George Washington students and faculty members through cooperative efforts which have been made through the Consortium of Washington Area Universities. These efforts should be continued. In addition, I am encouraged by the creation recently of a new organization, Friends of the Libraries of the George Washington University, which has among its objectives to "provide and attract new financial support to enrich the book collections of the Libraries." The organization has already taken action to designate its income from dues and gifts to be used annually for the book funds of the Law, Medical and University Libraries. It would be my hope that many members of the immediate University community, as well as friends and alumni from greater distances, will find this new organization to be high on their own priorities of interest in and support for the University.

In summary, let me say quite candidly that I have no argument with anyone who wishes to secure increased financial support for our Libraries. It is not enough, however, to request or suggest a "reordering of priorities." We now face a time when economic pressures make it increasingly hazardous to raise tuition as we have done over the past dozen years. More and more families are turning to public institutions for relief from the rapidly rising costs of private higher education. Our own reduction in entering classes is due, I believe, more directly to increasing costs than to any other single factor. Whether or not the present situation is temporary remains to be seen, and the extent to which, if any, relief may be found from Government subsidies is likewise unknown. Reordering priorities, therefore, must concern itself with reducing current expenditures, which can come about only by reassessing all of our programs and our ways of conducting them. With the help of a small Ford Foundation grant made two years ago and a small grant from the Sloan Foundation secured in January of 1972, the Budget Office under the direction of the Provost is vigorously pursuing a program budgeting effort in order that we may have better information in the future on which to make decisions regarding priorities. In the meantime, I believe further relief can be found by pushing cooperation through the Consortium of Universities as well as with other institutions in Washington which are rich in library resources and in vigorously purusing new support through Friends of the Libraries.

-0-

The George Washington University

Library Expenditures & Projected Budgets

1961-62 - 1975-76

		Library	Educational & General Expenditures	% to Educational & General
Expenditures	1961-62	239,000	12,900,000	1.9%
	1962-63	285,000	15,500,000	1.8%
	1963-64	289,000	17,700,000	1.6%
	1964-65	369,000	21,300,000	1.7%
(Ten Months)	1965-66	355,000	21,500,000	1.7%
	1966-67	507,000	29,000,000	1.7%
	1967-68	664,000	33,500,000	2.0%
	1968-69	840,000	36,150,000	2.3%
	1969-70	931,000	37,300,000	2.5%
	1970-71	1,134,000	39,100,000	2.9%
Projected Budgets	1971-72	1,205,000	43,581,000	2.8%
	1972-73	1,307,000	45,999,000	2.8%
	1973-74	1,479,000	47,909,000	3.1%
	1974-75	1,545,000	49,308,000	3.1%
	1975-76	1,614,000	50,740,000	3.2%

Not included in projected expenditures listed above:

In 1973-74 and thereafter - Operation and maintenance of New University Library will increase with inflation and other factors $190,000

- Debt service on new Library 250,000

$440,000

Reference Item 4a, Agenda 3/3/72 for March 10 meeting.

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
Washington, D. C.

FACULTY SENATE COMMITTEE ON PHYSICAL FACILITIES
SPECIAL REPORT

The Committee on Physical Facilities met on nine occasions under its charge from Senate Resolution 71/3 "to conduct such hearings and studies as it deems appropriate to advise the Senate as to what action or recommendations it should take with respect to new buildings." It heard testimony from six witnesses (see appendix A) who were not members of the committee and was advised of university practices by its ex officio members. In addition, the chairman spoke by telephone with the deans of architectural schools of Howard and Catholic Universities.

The committee was in agreement that the work involved in planning, designing, and constructing a new building is a complex undertaking that is baffling to laymen. Much of the work of the committee was directed towards comprehending the processes involved (see appendices B and C). The recommendations below can be better understood if the several stages or steps involved in constructing a new building are recognized (see appendix C).

The role of faculty and other lay users of a building can be most effective during the planning or programming phase of the construction process. It is at this stage that the user can make known his functional requirements which help to define the need for space, special facilities, and equipment. Increasingly, as the process moves through the final design phase, the work becomes heavily technical in character and the final features of the building become set.

The roles of the experts (planners, architects, engineers, and special consultants whose retention is particularly important in the design of highly specialized facilities) are important throughout the process. It is they, not the faculty of a school or department, who are experienced in building design. In this regard, the committee views with favor the budgetary allocations which will permit the hiring of two additional university architect-planners. Under the leadership of a Director of Planning and Construction, the university staff overseeing the construction of new buildings will have been augmented by six professionals since the completion of Building "C" and the University Center.

The committee did not attempt to assign "blame" for any alleged inadequacies of newly constructed buildings, nor indeed did it attempt fully to verify or refute them. It did attempt to learn the procedures followed by the university in planning and constructing a new building and took note of the fact that some segments of the university community expressed dissatisfaction with the law library and the University Center. Based on its understanding of university practices and the criticism leveled at certain recently constructed buildings, the committee has made recommendations which, together with the increase in professional staff noted above, will help ensure confidence that future construction will be planned carefully and designed with the highest professional competence.

By a unanimous vote, the committee recommends the following resolution to the Faculty Senate:

(71/32)

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY:

That the President, with the advice and consultation of the Faculty Senate, shall appoint a committee representative of the anticipated users of a proposed building to:

1. Advise and consult with the appropriate administrative officers in preparing the program for a new building;

2. Advise and consult with the appropriate administrative officers in the selection of an architect to design a new building;

3. Advise and consult with appropriate administrative officers and the architect after review of each of the program schematic, preliminary and final design stages; however, it is understood that instructions to the architect can be made only with the approval of the university's designated project officer; and

4. Promptly inform the Vice President and Treasurer in writing of their dissatisfaction with any phase of the planning or design processes.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED:

That periodic reports be made to the Committee on Physical Facilities of the Faculty Senate by appropriate administrative officers to advise of progress in the planning and design of each new building (including architect selection) and its relationship to overall campus plans.

- - - - - - - -

The committee wishes to stress the importance of a cooperative spirit among the several groups involved in the process of new construction. The University Planning and Construction staff must actively assist the Committee of Users in identifying and articulating their program needs and preferences and in interpreting the more technical features of the construction documents. The Committee of Users must be willing to spend the time required to define accurately their program requirements and to respond promptly to requests for information from the administrative planners. For its part, the architectural firm must assume the professional responsibility, after appropriate consultations with the Committee of Users and with the University Planning and Program staff, of designing a building which satisfies the aesthetic and functional requirements of the university.

In submitting its recommendations, the committee recognizes that final authority over decisions affecting new construction rests with the Board of Trustees or its delegated representatives among the administrative staff. It also recognizes that, with the

exception of architect selection, the procedures represent no sharp break with current practices. Nevertheless, it is felt that formalizing a process that ensures consultation with faculty (and other) groups of users is a sound way to promote satisfaction with our building program.

For the Committee

Hugh L. LeBlanc

Hugh L. LeBlanc, Chairman

The Committee

Herman H. Hobbs, Physics, Chairman - Fall Semester
Hugh L. LeBlanc, Political Science and Public Affairs, Chairman - Spring Semester
Frank D. Allan, M. D., Anatomy
Richard C. Allen, Law
G. M. Arkilic, Applied Science
James L. Breen, Physical Education
Sherwin Greene, Urban & Regional Planning
David G. White, Chemistry

Henry W. Herzog, Vice President and Treasurer, ex officio
J. C. Einbinder, Business Manager, ex officio
Charles E. Diehl, Assistant Vice President and Assistant Treasurer, ex officio

APPENDIX A

Witnesses who were not members of the Committee on Physical Facilities and who appeared before it in connection with the Committee's charge under Faculty Senate Resolution 71/3:

Hugh Y. Bernard, Law Librarian

Robert G. Bidwell, Assistant Law Librarian

Rupert Woodward, Director of Libraries

Charles B. Nutting, National Law Center

David Robinson, Jr., National Law Center

Boris C. Bell, Director, Marvin Center

- - - - - -

Enclosure with letter dated December 8, 1971, from Vice President and Treasurer Henry W. Herzog to the Chairman of the Senate Committee on Physical Facilities:

OFFICIAL UNIVERSITY PROCEDURE FOR THE SELECTION OF AN ARCHITECT FOR A GIVEN BUILDING

The architect for each project is selected by the Vice President and Treasurer and approved by the President of the University and the Board of Trustees.

In selecting architects, the Vice President and Treasurer bases his selection on the following general criteria:

1. The experience of the architect in work of similar size, type and complexity.

2. The competence of the architect in handling the work to be entrusted to him. Considerations in judging competence are:

   a. the size of his organization.
   b. the efficiency of the organization.
   c. the ability to design projects within cost limits.
   d. recommendations of other clients.

3. The standing of the architect in his profession.

4. The standing of the architect in the community.

5. Demonstration by the architect of the following:

   a. creative and artistic ability.
   b. technical competence.
   c. business and administrative capacity.
   d. ability to balance design with utility and maintenance.
   e. ability to cooperate with those involved in the project.
   f. good judgement and integrity.

6. The location of the office of the architect in close proximity to the University.

7. A full understanding by the architect of the D. C. Building Codes and Zoning Regulations and a good working relationship with D. C. Government Building Officials.

8. The confidence of and a good working relationship by the architect with the principal building contractors in the District.

9. An interest by the architect in the G. W. U. beyond that incorporated in the contract and the confidence of the Officers of the University and those responsible for the planning of the particular building in the architect.

In addition to the above general criteria, prior experience with the University is valuable because of:

1. Architect's knowledge of campus plan and planning policies.

2. Architect's experience in University building standards.

3. Architect's knowledge of University maintenance experience.

- - - - - - - -

Excerpt from minutes of the October 14, 1972, meeting of the Committee on Physical Facilities - Mr. Charles E. Diehl, Assistant Vice President and Assistant Treasurer, ex officio member of the committee, spoke as follows:

The process of getting a building built is an unusual process. It is an anachronism in today's world because it is perhaps the last area, except Medicine or Law, where so many individual actions have to be coordinated. It is a very elaborate process which proceeds over a very long period of time. It is an extremely difficult process. So much so that there have been organizations established just to conduct research into the communications within the construction industry, and the problem of passing information from step to step in the building process. A lot of people don't recognize how these steps proceed. Roughly, and quickly --

1. You start out with a function called planning. The planning function initially doesn't deal with drawings. In words, it defines the function, and the space, and special features.

2. After this step you produce what is known as a building program. Usually the program describes square footage and describes the functional concept of the building. What should the building be like, what is the site like, should it be high, what are constraints? Then dollar figures are arrived at. Then you take a look at it and ask, "Have we got enough money to meet this program," or "We don't have enough money; should we go get more, or should we squeeze the program?" This is the right way. If you don't proceed properly you start designing, you don't cost it out, and you often end up with a mess. You will be taking things out later that have already been spaced functionally on a drawing. When you pull something out it often leaves a void in the plans which should have been recognized at the program stage. The program is the essence of the whole matter. Without a decent well-defined program determined by people who are going to use the space, you might as well give up all hope of achieving anything you would want.

3. After you move out of the programming into the design stage, there are three stages in the designer's work. These are:

a) schematics, in which you take the functional layout and do line drawings, and you can look at the elevations and block and mass of the building and finally decide what the building is going to look like on the site. When you get finished you price it again and see how you are doing... if you don't like it you work the design over some more.

b) preliminary design is where you put the mechanical, electrical, and structural systems into the building. To make sure those systems all fit you come up with another set of drawings. This set is again priced out, and you again go through the items -- does it work, does it have a budget that will fit, does it look like we want it to look?

c) design development or working drawings is where we develop not only the drawings but the specifications. This is where you specify light fixtures, doorknobs, colors, finishes, built-in equipment, furniture, etc. You end up with plans and specifications for bidding or negotiating.

4. The next stage is the bidding phase. You put it out to contractors and go through the process of bidding. We were pleasantly surprised when we got the bids back on the Medical School. We had specified 21 alternates because we had doubts as to whether we could afford the building exactly as designed. Fortunately it came in under the bids. So this was valuable... something that went on in the bidding process which gave us some additional flexibility.

5. Next is the construction phase and this is a difficult phase--two or three years--you are dealing with the architect on a day-by-day basis, looking at shop drawings, looking at materials, looking at what the contractor is proposing to put into the building. We now have on the staff people whose job it is to work with the architect and help the ultimate user to make sure the users are getting what they need, that these things are suitable for the needs, and that equipment is going to work. The users are being brought into the process and know what is going on.

6. When you finally get through with the building and turn it over to the users, you go through a pretty exhaustive examination of the building, producing a check or punch list for the contractor to correct.

7. You also go through a checkout period in which the contractors train our Physical Plant personnel to operate the building and provide data on all the sophisticated equipment.

8. When you get all through with this checkout, we accept the building and turn it over to the Business Manager, Mr. Einbinder, and his people in Physical Plant and move in the users.

This is a complex process. It is long term and a difficult thing. In most every instance you are faced with a tremendous communication problem because most people are lazy mentally and they do not write down the action they took. They do not write down the basis for every decision. So to analyze at the end of the process what went on is like reaching under the table and grabbing. No one really knows who said what at what conference, or who said what over what telephone and why anything went the way it went. In fact, if you get a great building built at all it is to a degree good fortune.

- - - -

Faculty Senate

MEMORANDUM March 8, 1972

To: Members of the Faculty Senate

From: Chairman, Executive Committee

Subject: Supplement to Item 5(a) of Senate Agenda dated March 3, 1972, "Nomination of seven members of the faculty for presidential appointment to the Steering Committee for an All-University Assembly"

The nominees being recommended by the Executive Committee were not determined in time for listing in the Senate Agenda of March 3, 1972; however, it is hoped this supplemental notice will give you sufficient time for consideration:

A. E. Claeyssens, Jr., English
Norman C. Kramer, Medicine
Hugh L. LeBlanc, Political Science and Public Affairs
Margaret W. Montzka, Physics
David Robinson, Jr., Law
David B. Weaver, Law
Reuben E. Wood, Chemistry

Howard Pierpont

Howard Pierpont, M. D.

HP:ehr

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
Washington, D.C. 20006

Reference: Agenda Item 5a,
Faculty Senate Aagenda 3/3/72

Faculty Senate

MEMORANDUM March 3, 1972

To: Members of the Faculty Senate

From: Chairman, Executive Committee

Subject: Steering Committee for the All-University Assembly

The attached copy of letter from President Elliott is for your information. The Executive Committee will present a slate of nominees at the 10 March Senate meeting. Nominations from the floor will be in order.

Howard Pierpont

Howard Pierpont, M. D.

HP:ehr

Enclosure (see over)

THE
GEORGE
WASHINGTON
UNIVERSITY

*Washington, D.C. 20006 / **Office of the President** / (202) 676-6500*

February 23, 1972

MEMORANDUM TO: Dr. Howard C. Pierpont, Chairman
Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate

As you know, I have announced my intention of forming a Steering Committee to undertake the detailed study and subsequent design of the All-University Assembly. The Report of the Commission on Governance, which contained the recommendation for the Assembly, provided only a general rationale underlying the Commission's opinion as to the need for such a body. The Faculty Senate in its recommendations to me pointed out the need for careful analysis of the functions and composition of the Assembly as well as the need for clear definition of the Assembly's role vis-a-vis other advisory groups in the University. The Steering Committee which I propose to form in the near future must itself have representatives from all sectors of the University to permit the widest possible representation of views.

I would ask, therefore, that the Faculty Senate nominate to me seven members of the Faculty who are willing to serve on the Steering Committee. This group will join seven students (whom I shall select from among nominees proposed by the Student Nominating Board) and seven non-academic/alumni members (whom I shall appoint) on the Committee. I intend to appoint one of the Faculty nominees as Chairman.

I hope that the Executive Committee will be able to propose a slate of nominees to the March meeting of the Faculty Senate so that the Steering Committee can be appointed in the early spring.

Let me add at this time that the detailed recommendations of the Steering Committee will be submitted to the Faculty Senate and to the Faculty Assembly prior to submission to the Board of Trustees.

Lloyd H. Elliott

Lloyd H. Elliott

cc: Mr. Birnbaum

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

INTERDEPARTMENTAL MEMORANDUM

Hyman - III - 3

Griffith - III - 46

Rahman - III - 5

Griffith

Hill - ~~IIII~~ I - 6

Hymon - ~~IIII~~ II - 7

Huffett - ~~IIII~~ II - 7

Robinson - 7